arXiv:hep-th/0601087v1 13 Jan 2006

SYMMETRIC DISCRETE QUOTIENTS OF SUPERSYMMETRIC HPP-WAVES AND SPIN STRUCTURES

HANNU J. RAJANIEMI

ABSTRACT. We explore the importance of the choice of spin structure in determining the amount of supersymmetry preserved by a symmetric M-theory background constructed by quotienting a supersymmetric Hpp-wave with a discrete subgroup in the centraliser of its isometry group.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Discrete quotients and spin structures 2
3. Hpp-waves in M-theory 2
4. Symmetric discrete quotients of Hpp-waves 7
4.1. The maximally supersymmetric case 8
4.2. The four-parameter case 10
4.3. The seven-parameter case 11
5. A conjecture 12
6. Conclusions 13
References 13
Appendix A. Metrics of pp-waves with supernumerary supersymmetries 15

1. INTRODUCTION

A (bosonic) M-theory background is usually defined as consisting of the data (M, g, F), where (M, g) is a Lorentzian manifold with metric g and F is a closed four-form. In addition F and g obey certain field equations that do not concern us here.

The authors of [1] observed that it is possible to construct examples of non-simply connected isometric M-theory backgrounds that have the same geometry and four-form F but admit different fractions of supersymmetry depending on the choice of the spin structure. Therefore, it would seem necessary to include the choice of spin structure in the data defining a M-theory background as well. The purpose of this note is to illustrate this point further by considering backgrounds that are Lorentzian symmetric spaces

---

Date: February 1, 2008.

(Cahen-Wallach spaces), as opposed to the Freund-Rubin solutions involving spherical space forms that were treated in [1]. We will show that at least for known *symmetric* M-theory backgrounds with with more than 16 Killing spinors the choice of spin structure that preserves any supersymmetry appears to be unique. In particular, this includes symmetric discrete quotients of M-theory pp-wave solutions.

The relationship between the choice of the spin structure of a Lorentzian symmetric space and the dimension of the space of its *twistor spinors* was first considered in [2], and although the details are slightly different when we consider Killing spinors, our techniques owe much to this previous work. In the case of non-conformally flat symmetric spaces the twistor spinors actually agree with parallel spinors, corresponding to supergravity Killing spinors when $F = 0$. Since this case was already treated in detail in [2], we will focus on solutions that admit a nonzero four-form flux. Orbifolds of 11-dimensional pp-wave solutions have also been considered previously in [3], but only for a very particular solution with 26 supersymmetries.

2. Discrete quotients and spin structures

Let (M, g) be a simply connected n-dimensional Lorentzian spin manifold. We denote its isometry group by $I(M, g)$. Suppose $D \subset I(M, g)$ is a discrete, orientation-preserving subgroup, and let e_B, $B = 0 \ldots n-1$ be a pseudo-orthonormal frame on M. Then for any $\gamma \in D$ at a point $x \in M$, $d\gamma_x \in \mathrm{SO}(1, n-1)$ corresponds to the linear map that transforms $e_A(x)$ to $e_A(\gamma(x))$. There are now two possible lifts of $d\gamma_x$ to $\mathrm{Spin}(1, n-1)$ since the covering map $\mathrm{Spin}(1, n-1) \to \mathrm{SO}(1, n-1)$ is two-to-one: we denote these by $\pm\Gamma(x)$.

Now let $\mathcal{E}(D)$ be the set of all left actions of D on $M \times \mathrm{Spin}(1, n-1)$ satisfying

$$\epsilon(\gamma)(x, a) = (\gamma(x), \epsilon(\gamma, x) \cdot a) \ , \tag{1}$$

where $\epsilon(\gamma, x) = \pm\Gamma(x)$.

Elements of $\mathcal{E}(D)$ correspond to spin structures on $N = M/D$. The spinor bundle corresponding to $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}(D)$ is given by

$$S_\epsilon = (M \times \Delta_{1,n-1}) / \epsilon \ , \tag{2}$$

Here $\Delta_{1,n-1}$ is the spinor module and $\epsilon(\gamma)(x, \psi(x)) = (\gamma(x), \epsilon(\gamma, x) \cdot \psi(x))$. It follows that the spinor fields ψ on N are the spinor fields on M that satisfy

$$\psi(\gamma(x)) = \epsilon(\gamma, x) \cdot \psi(x) \ . \tag{3}$$

In particular, when M is a M-theory background and D also preserves the four-form F, the Killing spinors on $N = M/D$ are the ϵ-invariant Killing spinors of M.

3. Hpp-waves in M-theory

The M-theory Hpp-waves are supersymmetric solutions of eleven-dimensional supergravity equipped with the metric of a Lorentzian symmetric space of the Cahen-Wallach type [4] and a null homogeneous four-form. In the light-cone coordinates $x^{\pm}, x^i, i = 1 \dots 9$ the Cahen-Wallach metric can be written as

$$g = 2dx^+dx^- + \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}x^ix^j \left(dx^-\right)^2 + \sum_i \left(dx^i\right)^2 \tag{4}$$

where A_{ij} is a real 9×9 symmetric matrix. If A_{ij} is nondegenerate, (M, g) is indecomposable; otherwise it decomposes to a product of a lower-dimensional indecomposable CW space and an Euclidean space. If A_{ij} is zero, (4) is simply the metric on flat space. As noted in the introduction, we will only be considering cases with nonzero F.

The moduli space of CW metrics agrees with the space of unordered eigenvalues of A_{ij} up to a positive scale: this space is diffeomorphic to S^8/Σ_9, where Σ_9 is the permutation group of nine objects[4]. In particular, a positive rescaling of A_{ij} can always be absorbed by a coordinate transformation. It is, of course, also possible to exhibit (M, g) as a symmetric space by constructing its transvection group G_A for which (4) is the invariant metric. We refer the reader to [4] for details.

A natural choice of F is a four-form preserved by the symmetries of the CW metric that also satisfies the field equations. As explained e.g. in [5, 4], the natural choice is a parallel form

$$F = dx^- \wedge \Theta \ ,$$

where Θ is a 3-form on $\mathbb{R}^9$. The equations of motion imply that $\operatorname{Tr} A = -\frac{1}{2}|\Theta|^2$.

We will make use of a global pseudo-orthonormal frame:

$$\begin{aligned} e_+ &= \partial_+, \\ e_i &= \partial_i, \\ e_- &= \partial_- - \sum_{i,j} \tfrac{1}{2} A_{ij}x^ix^j\partial_+ \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding coframe

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^+ &= dx^+ + \tfrac{1}{2}A_{ij}x^ix^jdx^- \\ \theta^- &= dx^- \\ \theta^i &= dx^i \ . \end{aligned}$$

For the purposes of this note, there is no need to distinguish between coordinate and frame indices.

The only nonzero connection forms for the metric (4) are

$$\omega^{+i} = A^i{}_j x^j dx^- \ . \tag{5}$$

The Clifford algebra convention we use is

$$\Gamma_A\Gamma_B + \Gamma_B\Gamma_A = -2\eta_{AB}. \tag{6}$$

where η_{AB} is the flat Minkowski metric with $\eta_{-+} = 1$ and $\eta_{ij} = -\delta_{ij}$. In other words, the flat metric has “mostly minus” signature.

Supergravity Killing spinors are parallel sections of the supercovariant connection

$$\mathcal{D}_X = \nabla_X + \frac{1}{6}\imath_X F + \frac{1}{12} X^\flat \wedge F := \nabla_X + \Omega_X \ ,$$

where $X^\flat$ is the one-form metric dual of the vector field X and the forms act on spinors via Clifford multiplication. The spinor module is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{32}$ and hence the maximum possible dimension for the space of Killing spinors is 32. There are actually two possible spinor modules: the one consistent with our conventions is the one on which the action of the centre of the Clifford algebra is nontrivial. For convenience, we denote the fraction of supersymmetry a M-theory background admits by $\nu = \frac{1}{32}\dim \operatorname{Ker} \mathcal{D}$.

For the generic Hpp solution with arbitrary A_{ij} and Θ one finds ([4]) that the solutions to the Killing spinor equation

$$\mathcal{D}\chi = 0 \tag{7}$$

take the form

$$\chi(\psi_+) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{24}\Theta_{ijk}\Gamma^{ijk}\right)\psi_+ \ , \tag{8}$$

where $\psi_+ \in \operatorname{Ker}\Gamma_+$ is a constant spinor. In other words, for the generic Hpp solution, $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$.

There is, however, a special point in the moduli space with

$$\Theta \ = \ \mu dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \ , \tag{9}$$

$$A_{ij} \ = \ \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{9}\mu^2\delta_{ij} & i,j = 1,2,3 \\ -\frac{1}{36}\mu^2\delta_{ij} & i,j = 4\ldots 9 \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

which preserves *all* supersymmetry. The explicit expression for the Killing spinors of this background was given in [4]:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\psi_+,\psi_-}(x) = &\left(\cos\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right)\mathbb{1} - \sin\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right)I\right)\psi_+ \\ &+ \left(\cos\left(\frac{\mu}{12}x^-\right)\mathbb{1} - \sin\left(\frac{\mu}{12}x^-\right)I\right)\psi_- \\ -\frac{1}{6}\mu&\left(\sum_{i\le 3} x^i\Gamma_i - \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{i\ge 4} x^i\Gamma_i\right)\left(\sin\left(\frac{\mu}{12}x^-\right)\mathbb{1} - \cos\left(\frac{\mu}{12}x^-\right)I\right)\Gamma_+\psi_- \ , \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $I = \Gamma_{123}$, $I^2 = -\mathbb{1}$ and $\psi_\pm \in \operatorname{Ker}\Gamma_\pm$ are arbitrary constant spinors.

In addition to the maximally supersymmetric Hpp-solution and the generic $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS solution with arbitrary A, there are a number of other interesting loci in the Hpp-wave moduli space. In [6] Gauntlett and Hull constructed Hpp-solutions admitting "exotic" values of $\nu = \frac{9}{16}, \frac{5}{8}, \frac{11}{16}, \frac{3}{4}$. These solutions possess Killing spinors that lie in $\operatorname{Ker}\Gamma_-$(often referred to as supernumerary Killing spinors) in addition to the "generic" ones given in (8). As we will see, in these cases the 3-form Θ takes a very particular form.

We briefly outline how one obtains the form of the Killing spinors in these cases. Since $\Omega_i\Omega_j = 0$ for all i,j, a Killing spinor ε can always be written in the form

$$\varepsilon_{\psi_+,\psi_-}(x) = \left(\mathbb{1} + x^i\Omega_i\right)\chi \ , \tag{12}$$

where $\Omega_i = -\frac{1}{24}\left(\Gamma_i\Theta + 3\Theta\Gamma_i\right)\Gamma_+$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_+ &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}x^-\Theta\right)\psi_+ \ , \\ \chi_- &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{12}x^-\Theta\right)\psi_- \ . \end{aligned}$$

As in the generic case, ψ_+ is an arbitrary constant spinor annihilated by Γ_+. However, now the $\psi_- \in \mathrm{Ker}_-$ are not arbitrary. Since Ω_i always involves Γ_+, substituting (12) into the Killing spinor equation (7) imposes no extra conditions on χ_+. But further analysis reveals that (7) can be split into independent x^- - and x^i -dependent parts, the former of which gives the form of χ_- and the latter can be written as

$$\left(-144\sum_j A_{jk}\Gamma_k + X_j^2\Gamma_j\right)\chi_- = 0 \ , \tag{13}$$

for each j, where $X_j = \Gamma_j\Theta\Gamma_j + 3\Theta$. Finding solutions with supernumerary Killing spinors amounts to finding solutions to this equation.

Let us assume that A has been brought to a diagonal form via an orthogonal transformation so that $A = \mathrm{diag}(\mu_1, \mu_2 \ldots \mu_9)$, $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then in order to find solutions to equation (13), we must ensure that the action of X_j^2 on spinors is diagonalisable. Since X_i involves the 3-form Θ, the natural next step is to find a diagonalisable ansatz for Θ. To do this, we actually need to complexify the spinors, i.e. look at the action of Θ on the bundle $S \otimes \mathbb{C}$.

It is well known that the Lie algebra of SO(16) is isomorphic to $\bigwedge^2\mathbb{R}^9 \oplus \bigwedge^3\mathbb{R}^9 \equiv \mathfrak{so}(9) \oplus \bigwedge^3\mathbb{R}^9$. In particular, given a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{so}(16)$ (generated by skew-diagonal matrices with purely imaginary skew eigenvalues), there is a decomposition $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}_2 \oplus \mathfrak{h}_3$, where $\mathfrak{h}_2 \subset \mathfrak{so}(9)$ and $\mathfrak{h}_3 \subset \bigwedge^3\mathbb{R}^9$. Since the $\mathfrak{so}(16)$ has rank 8 and $\mathfrak{so}(9)$ has rank 4, we can associate $n \leq 4$ 2-form generators and $8-n$ 3-form generators to every Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ via the isomorphism.

Now obviously

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathfrak{h}_2, \mathfrak{h}_2] &\subset \mathfrak{h}_2 \ , \\ [\mathfrak{h}_2, \mathfrak{h}_3] &\subset \mathfrak{h}_3 \ , \end{aligned}$$

since elements of $\mathfrak{h}_2$ act as infinitesimal $SO(9)$-rotations. Note that this doesn't necessarily imply that $\mathfrak{h}_3$ is commutative.

But if we further assume that $\mathfrak{h}_3$ is also a Cartan subalgebra (so that $[\mathfrak{h}_3, \mathfrak{h}_3] = 0$ and hence $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}_3] = 0$ as well), a direct calculation [7] shows that only cases that occur are $n = 1$ and $n = 3$, and a convenient choices for 2-form and 3-form generators in terms of gamma matrix monomials are

$$\begin{gathered} \Gamma_{12},\ \Gamma_{34},\ \Gamma_{56},\ \Gamma_{78} \\ \Gamma_{129},\ \Gamma_{349},\ \Gamma_{569},\ \Gamma_{789} \end{gathered}$$

in the $n = 1$ case and

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma_{78} \\ &\Gamma_{123},\ \Gamma_{145},\ \Gamma_{167},\ \Gamma_{246},\ \Gamma_{257},\ \Gamma_{347},\ \Gamma_{356} \end{aligned}$$

in the $n = 3$ case.

These two orbit types give rise to 3-form ansätze whose action on (complexified) spinors can be diagonalised. The ansatz for Θ is then

$$\Theta = \alpha_1 dx^{129} + \alpha_2 dx^{349} + \alpha_3 dx^{569} + \alpha_4 dx^{789} \tag{14}$$

or

$$\Theta = \beta_1 dx^{123} + \beta_2 dx^{145} + \beta_3 dx^{167} + \beta_4 dx^{246} + \beta_5 dx^{257} + \beta_6 dx^{347} + \beta_7 dx^{356} , \tag{15}$$

where the α's and β's are real parameters. As pointed out in [8], if the α's are set to be equal, Θ is proportional to $dx^9 \wedge \omega$, where ω is the Kähler form on $\mathbb{R}^8$. Similarly, if the β's agree in the second ansatz, Θ is proportional to the G_2-invariant associative 3-form on $\mathbb{R}^7$. In both cases each of the three-form terms $\Gamma_{i_1 i_2 i_3}$ for $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{1 \dots 9\}$ is a complex structure on the spinor bundle, so when diagonalised they act as $\pm i$. The skew eigenvalues of Θ in the four-parameter case are $i\lambda_a, a = 1 \dots 8$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1 &= \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_4 \\
\lambda_2 &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4 \\
\lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_4 \\
\lambda_4 &= -\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4 \\
\lambda_5 &= -\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \\
\lambda_6 &= \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \\
\lambda_7 &= \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \\
\lambda_8 &= -\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + \alpha_4
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly the skew eigenvalues in the seven-parameter case are given by $i\lambda'_a, a = 1 \dots 8$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda'_1 &= -\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7 \\
\lambda'_2 &= -\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7 \\
\lambda'_3 &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7 \\
\lambda'_4 &= \beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7 \\
\lambda'_5 &= \beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7 \\
\lambda'_6 &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7 \\
\lambda'_7 &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7 \\
\lambda'_8 &= -\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by choosing suitable α's or β's, some of the eigenvalues can be made to vanish, i.e. Θ can have a nontrivial kernel. Equation (8) then implies that the subspace of Killing spinors that lies in $\operatorname{Ker}\Theta$ will be independent of x^-.

We can now work out the possible A that can occur in these ansätze, using the procedure explained in [8]. In the 4-parameter case, $X_9 = 4\Theta$ acting on χ_-, and thus

$$\mu_9^2 = \frac{1}{9}\lambda_a^2 \tag{16}$$

for some choice of λ_a. That is, *a priori* we can choose χ_- to be any eigenspinor of Θ, and this choice in turn determines the rest of the μ_i. For example, consider the direction $i = 1$. To determine μ_1, we need to solve the equation $(X_1 - \kappa_1)\,\Gamma_1\chi_-$. Substituting $X_1 = \Gamma_1\Theta\Gamma_1 + 3\Theta$, we find that

$$\lambda_a\chi_- + 3\Gamma_1\Theta\Gamma_1\chi_- - \kappa_1\chi_- = 0 \ . \tag{17}$$

Looking at the form of Θ, it is easy to see that the eigenvalues of $\Gamma_1\Theta\Gamma_1$ obtained from those of Θ by reversing the signs of α_2, α_3 and α_4 (since Γ_1 anticommutes with these terms). Applying this to λ_a is sufficient to solve the previous equation. Following this procedure we can solve the rest of the μ_i. A similar argument works in the 7-parameter case: now $X_8 = X_9 = 2\Theta$. The possible metrics that can occur can be found in Appendix A. Note that in the four-parameter case $\mu_1^2 = \mu_2^2$, $\mu_3^2 = \mu_4^2$, $\mu_5^2 = \mu_6^2$, $\mu_7^2 = \mu_8^2$ and in the four-parameter case $\mu_8^2 = \mu_9^2$.

The degeneracy of eigenspinors of Θ satisfying (13) gives the dimension of supernumerary Killing spinors. In the generic case where the coefficients of Θ are arbitrary there are 2 supernumerary Killing spinors, but there can be more if the coefficients are chosen so that some of the λ_a's or λ'_a's agree. The conditions for degeneracy are worked out in detail in [6].

In both cases the supernumerary Killing spinors are independent of x^- if and only if $\mu_9 = 0$. Furthermore, if one or more of the μ_i vanish, the Killing spinors will be independent of the corresponding transverse coordinates x^i. For these solutions the metric will be decomposable: the product of a lower-dimensional pp-wave with an Euclidean space.

4. Symmetric discrete quotients of Hpp-waves

Considering all possible quotients of Hpp-solutions by discrete subgroups of $I(M,g,F) \subset I(M,g)$ (the subgroup of the isometry group of M,g that also preserves the four-form F) is somewhat intractable since we have no classification of the crystallographic subgroups of Hpp-wave isometry groups at hand. Therefore, we will restrict ourselves to quotients that are also symmetric. It is known [9] that a quotient of a symmetric space $M = G/H$ (where G is a Lie group and H is the stabiliser subgroup of a point) by a discrete subgroup $D \subset I(M,g)$ is also symmetric if and only if D lies in the centraliser of $I(M,g)$ inside the transvection group G. In other words, we want to study quotients by discrete subgroups $D \subset Z$, where

$$Z = \{x \in I(M,g) \mid xh = hx \ \forall h \in G\} \ . \tag{18}$$

The isometries and conformal symmetries of Cahen-Wallach spaces were investigated by Cahen and Kerbrat in [10]. They also give expressions for the centralisers that can occur.

There are two possibilities:

Case 1. *One of the eigenvalues* $\mu_i > 0$ *for some* i, or $\frac{\mu_i}{\mu_j} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ *for some* (i,j). *Then*

$$Z \simeq \mathbb{R} = \{\gamma_\alpha \mid \gamma_\alpha\left(x^+, x^-, x^i\right) = \left(x^+ + \alpha, x^-, x^i\right) \ , \tag{19}$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

Case 2. *All the eigenvalues μ_i are negative and $\frac{\mu_i}{\mu_j} \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all (i,j). We write $\mu_i = -k_i^2$ for all i. Then*

$$Z = \{\gamma_{\alpha,\underline{m}} \mid \gamma_{\alpha,\underline{m}}\left(x^+, x^-, x^i\right) = \left(x^+ + \alpha, x^- + \beta, (-1)^{m_i} x^i\right)\} \ , \tag{20}$$

where $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta = \frac{\pi m_i}{k_i}$ for all i.

The ratio of m_i and k_i is the same for all i, and for any (i,j) we can write

$$m_i = \frac{k_i m_j}{k_j} \ . \tag{21}$$

The values of all m_i are determined by any one of them, so in fact $Z \simeq \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ in this case. Also note that for N to be orientable, $\sum_{i=1}^{9} m_i$ must be even: otherwise the volume form $\mathrm{dvol} = dx^+ \wedge dx^- \wedge dx^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^9$ would not be left invariant.

Qualitatively speaking, in all cases quotienting by the action of Z consists of periodic identifications of the light-cone coordinates and $\mathbb{Z}_2$-orbifoldings of the transverse coordinates. We observe that all the pp-wave solutions with supernumerary supersymmetries are examples of Case 2, provided that the ratios of the coefficients appearing in Θ are also rational.

We are also interested in spinors (in particular Killing spinors) that are left invariant by the quotient. In Case 2, a discrete subgroup $D_{\alpha,\underline{m}} \subset Z$ is generated by the elements $\gamma_{\alpha,0}$ and $\gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$. Their derivatives acting on the frame bundle are

$$\begin{aligned} d\gamma_{\alpha,0} &= \mathbb{1}_{11\times 11} \ , \\ d\gamma_{0,k} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (-1)^{m_1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & (-1)^{m_2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & (-1)^{m_9} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $m_{s_1}, m_{s_2} \ldots, m_{s_r}$ are the odd m_i. The fact that we want $D_{\alpha,\underline{m}}$ to preserve orientation means that r is even, as we mentioned previously. Then the quotient $N = M/D_{\alpha,\underline{m}}$ has four possible spin structures, corresponding to the two possible lifts of $d\gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$: $\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}} = \pm\Gamma_{s_1 s_2 \ldots s_r} \in \mathrm{Spin}(9)$ and $\Gamma_{\alpha,0} = \pm\mathbb{1}$ [2]. Using these expressions and equation (3), we can then study the existence of invariant spinors explicitly.

It is easy to see that quotients of solutions for which Case 1 applies are rather trivial: there are only two possible spin structures and since generic Killing spinors do not depend on x^+, only the trivial lift of $\gamma_{\alpha,0}$ will preserve any (and in fact all) Killing spinors. Therefore, in the sequel we will focus on the solutions that admit supernumerary Killing spinors.

4.1. **The maximally supersymmetric case.** To begin with a simple example before studying the generaly supernumerary case in detail, let us analyse the symmetric discrete quotients of the maximally supersymmetric solution (9) and see which choices of spin structure preserve Killing spinors. Now A_{ij} is diagonal and all eigenvalues of are negative,so Case 2 above applies.

To obtain a quotient isometric to (M,g,F) as a supergravity solution, we want to focus on a subgroup $Z_F \subset Z$ that also preserves the four-form F. Looking at the form of F in (9), we observe that an element $\gamma_{\alpha,\underline{m}} \in Z$ will preserve F if and only if *none* of (m_1, m_2, m_3) are odd or if *two* of them are: $\gamma_{\alpha,\underline{m}}$ acts trivially on dx^-. Now

$$k_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3}\mu \ , i = 1\dots 3 \\ \frac{1}{6}\mu \ , i = 4\dots 9 \end{cases}$$

But since the k_i are equal for $i = 1\dots 3$, equation (21) implies that $m_1 = m_2 = m_3$. Therefore, for $\gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$ to preserve F, $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 \equiv 2k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Equation (21) also implies that $m_4 = \dots = m_9 \equiv k$. We conclude that

$$Z_F = \{\gamma_{\alpha,k} \in Z \mid \gamma_{\alpha,k}(x^+, x^-, x^i) = \left(x^+ + \alpha, x^- + \beta, x^{1,2,3}, (-1)^k x^{4,\dots,9}\right)\} \ , \tag{22}$$

where $\beta = \frac{6\pi k}{\mu}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

A discrete subgroup $D_{\alpha,k}$ of Z_F is generated by elements $\gamma_{\alpha,0}$ and $\gamma_{0,1}$. Looking at the condition (3), it is again obvious that if $d\gamma_{\alpha,0}$ lifts to $-\mathbb{1}$, no spinors will be left invariant. But provided that $\Gamma_{\alpha,0} = \mathbb{1}$, there are two possible spin structures depending on the choice of sign for $\pm\Gamma_{0,1}$.

The derivative of $\gamma_{0,1}$ lifts to the spinor bundle as $\pm\Gamma_{4\dots 9}$. Using the familiar trigonometric identities $\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta\right) = -\sin\theta$ and $\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta\right) = \cos\theta$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\psi_+,\psi_-}\left(\gamma_{(0,1)}(x)\right) &= \left(-\cos\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right)\mathbb{1} + \sin\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right) I\right)\psi_+ \\ &\quad + \left(\cos\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right) I + \sin\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right)\mathbb{1}\right)\psi_- \\ + \tfrac{1}{6}\mu &\left(\sum_{i\le 3} x^i\Gamma_i + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{\ge 4} x^i\Gamma_i\right)\left(\cos\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right)\mathbb{1} + \sin\left(\frac{\mu}{4}x^-\right) I\right)\Gamma_+\psi_- \ , \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Comparing this expression with (8) and noting that $\Gamma_{0,1}$ anticommutes with Γ_i for $i = 4\dots 9$, we find that we can write this as

$$\varepsilon_{\psi_+,\psi_-}\left(\gamma_{0,1}(x)\right) = \varepsilon_{-I\psi_+, I\psi_-}(x) \ .$$

Thus, the action of $\gamma_{(0,1)}$ leaves ε invariant if

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{0,1}\psi_+ &= -I\psi_+ \ , \\ \Gamma_{0,1}\psi_- &= I\psi_- \ , \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we have chosen the spinor module for which the action of the centre of the Clifford algebra (and thus the volume element) agrees with $-\mathbb{1}$. Then

$$\Gamma_{-+}\Gamma_{1\dots 9}\psi_+ = -\psi_+ \ , \tag{24}$$

implies that (since $\Gamma_{-+} = \Gamma_-\Gamma_+ + \mathbb{1}$)

$$\Gamma_{4\dots 9}\psi_+ = I\psi_+ \ .$$

Correspondingly, $\Gamma_{4\dots 9}\psi_- = -I\psi_-$. Thus, equation (23) is satisfied if and only if $\Gamma_{0,1} = -\Gamma_{4\dots 9}$. We can therefore conclude that for all symmetric discrete quotients of the maximally supersymmetric Hpp-wave, out of the four possible choices of spin structure there is precisely one that preserves any (and indeed, all) supersymmetry.

4.2. **The four-parameter case.** Going through all possible quotients of supernumerary pp-wave solutions listed in Appendix A using the explicit form of the Killing spinors would be somewhat tedious, so instead we use a method that can be implemented more easily using a computer program (in our case, a Mathematica notebook).

To study the moduli space of possible quotients, we could take the coefficients of Θ as the data, allow them to vary and examine the consequences, as in [6]. However, for computational purposes it is actually more useful to take the 9-tuple $(m_1, \ldots, m_9)$ and the eigenvalue λ_{a_0} (where λ_{a_0} is the eigenvalue chosen to appear in equation (16), that is, $\mu_9 = \frac{1}{9}\lambda_{a_0}^2$) as the data defining a quotient. Looking at the different metrics appearing in Table A, we find that it is always possible to express the α's — and thus the eigenvalues λ_a — in terms of k_i (recall that the k_i are related to the eigenvalues of the matrix A by $\mu_i = -k_i^2$). In other words, we can write $\lambda_a = \sum_i c_i k_i$ for each λ_a and for some coefficients c_i. Given $(m_1, \ldots, m_9)$, we can use equation (21) to determine the k_i and hence the coefficients $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_4$. Knowing $m_1 \ldots, m_9, \lambda_{a_0}$ for the quotient is thus sufficient to determine the original solution.

Restricting to Z_F, the subgroup of Z that also preserves the four-form F, we observe that m_9 must always be even. Using the equation (21) and the remarks in section 3, we also know that $m_1 = m_2$, $m_3 = m_4$, $m_5 = m_6$ and $m_7 = m_8$. To preserve orientation, $\sum_i m_i$ has to be even as well, but in this case this imposes no further restrictions, since there is always an even number of odd m_i.

It is convenient to express the Killing spinors using the eigenspinors of Θ as a basis. Note that acting on the λ_a-eigenspace, $J_{\lambda_a} = \frac{1}{\lambda_a}\Theta$ is a complex structure. Thus, we can write the exponentials appearing in $\chi_\pm$ explicitly as

$$\chi_+ = \sum_{a=1}^{8} \left(\cos\left(\tfrac{\lambda_a x^-}{4}\right) + i\sin\left(\tfrac{\lambda_a x^-}{4}\right)\right)\psi_+(\lambda_a) \ , \tag{25}$$

$$\chi_- = \left(\cos\left(\tfrac{\lambda_{a_0} x^-}{12}\right) + i\sin\left(\tfrac{\lambda_{a_0} x^-}{12}\right)\right)\psi_+(\lambda_{a_0}) \tag{26}$$

where $\Theta \cdot \psi_\pm(\lambda_a) = i\lambda_a\psi_\pm(\lambda_a)$.

To determine the fraction of supersymmetry preserved by a symmetric discrete quotient, we need to work out how $\gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$ and $\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$ act on $\chi_\pm$. Recall that $\gamma_{0,\underline{m}}(x^-) = x^- + \frac{m_i}{k_i}\pi$ for some i. Computing the action of this shift on $\chi_\pm$ is straightforward. As mentioned above, we can express the α's — and thus the eigenvalues λ_a — in terms of k_i. Thus,

$$\lambda_a \frac{m_j}{k_j} = \sum_i c_i \frac{m_j k_i}{kj} \tag{27}$$

$$= \sum_i c_i m_i \ , \tag{28}$$

so under the action of the isometry, $\lambda_a x^- \to \lambda_a x^- + \pi \sum_i c_i m_i$. Using this observation and usual trigonometric identities, we can work out how the trigonometric functions in (25) transform under $\gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$.

We also need to know how $\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$ acts on the eigenspinors. Since we're taking the m_i to be our data, it is not hard to enumerate the possibilities. In the four-parameter case, each of m_1, m_3, m_4, m_5 and m_7 can be even or odd.

If we write the 3-form in this ansatz as $\Theta = \alpha_1 I_1 + \alpha_2 I_2 + \alpha_3 I_3 + \alpha_4 I_4$, we can express any λ as

$$\lambda = \epsilon_1(\lambda)\alpha_1 + \epsilon_2(\lambda)\alpha_2 + \epsilon_3(\lambda)\alpha_3 + \epsilon_4(\lambda)\alpha_4 \ , \tag{29}$$

where $I_p \psi_\pm(\lambda) = i\epsilon_p(\lambda)\psi_\pm(\lambda)$, $p = 1 \dots 4$ and $\epsilon_p(\lambda) = \pm 1$. It is not hard to see that any $\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$ can be written as a product of the I_p's or identified with such a product via the identity $\Gamma_{1\dots 9}\psi_\pm = \pm\psi$ that relates the Clifford action of a form on $\mathbb{R}^9$ to that of its dual. We can thus always write

$$\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}} = \epsilon(q) I_{p_1} I_{p_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot I_{p_q}$$

acting on ψ_+ and

$$\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}} = -\epsilon(q) I_{p_1} I_{p_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot I_{p_q}$$

acting on ψ_-, where $1 \le q \le 4$ and $\epsilon(q) = -1$ if $q = 1$ and 1 otherwise.

Since the action of each of the I_p on $\psi_\pm(\lambda)$ is fixed by equation (29), the action of $\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$ on $\psi_\pm(\lambda)$ is given by

$$\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}} \cdot \psi_\pm(\lambda) = \mp\epsilon(q)\epsilon_{p_1}\epsilon_{p_2}\dots\epsilon_{p_q} i^q \psi_+(\lambda) \ ,$$

With these observations, the problem becomes essentially algorithmic and can be easily implemented in a symbolic computation environment. We have written a Mathematica notebook[1] that goes through the elements $\gamma_{\alpha,\underline{m}}$ that generate discrete subgroups D and computes their action on the Killing spinors. It turns out that for every quotient, the result is similar to what occurs in the maximally supersymmetric case: out of the four possible spin structures, there is only one that preserves any of the original Killing spinors.

4.3. **The seven-parameter case.**

The method we described in the previous section also works in the seven-parameter case, but now we must take care to ensure that the discrete subgroups D also preserve the four-form F. The most convenient way to express this condition is to require that for each term Γ_{ijk} appearing in Θ, $m_i + m_j + m_k$ must be even. In other words, we have the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
m_1 + m_2 + m_3 &= 0\\
m_1 + m_4 + m_5 &= 0\\
m_1 + m_6 + m_7 &= 0\\
m_2 + m_4 + m_6 &= 0\\
m_2 + m_5 + m_7 &= 0\\
m_3 + m_4 + m_7 &= 0\\
m_3 + m_5 + m_6 &= 0 \ .
\end{aligned}$$

---

[1] Available upon request from the author.

modulo 2. This system of equations is not hard to solve over $\mathbb{Z}_2$, and thus we find that the possible forms that $\Gamma_{0,\underline{m}}$ can take are:

$$\begin{gathered}\pm\Gamma_{1247},\ \pm\Gamma_{1256},\ \pm\Gamma_{1346}\\ \pm\Gamma_{1357},\ \pm\Gamma_{2345},\ \pm\Gamma_{2367},\ \pm\Gamma_{4567}\end{gathered}$$

Again, we note that all these terms can be written as products of terms in Θ, and thus the method described in the previous section works, provided that we take the above constraints into account.

Examining all the possible quotients yields the same result as in the four-parameter case: for all possible quotients, there is only *one* choice of spin structure that preserves any (and indeed all) of the supersymmetry of the original background. Furthermore, we do not obtain any new fractions of supersymmetry in either case.

5. A CONJECTURE

The results of the previous section lead to the curious observation that all symmetric quotients of known symmetric M-theory backgrounds with more than 16 Killing spinors possess a unique spin structure that preserves supersymmetry – in contrast to the supersymmetric space forms described in [1]. The only such backgrounds we haven't yet considered are Freund-Rubin -type solutions of the form AdS $\times S/\mathbb{Z}_2$, since the only symmetric spherical space form is the projective space[11], and it is easy to see that there is no ambiguity about the choice of spin structure in this case – this situation only arises if $|D| \geq 4$, where D is the discrete group used in the quotient[1]. Thus we arrive at a

Conjecture 1. *All symmetric quotients of symmetric M-theory backgrounds for which $\nu > \frac{1}{2}$ possess a unique spin structure which preserves all of the original supersymmetry.*

We now show that the requirement $\nu > \frac{1}{2}$ is in fact necessary.

Provided that we drop the requirement of supernumerary Killing spinors, it is not hard to exhibit examples of symmetric quotients of Hpp-waves that admit more than one spin structure preserving some Killing spinors. For example, consider a solution of the form

$$\Theta = \mu\left(dx^{129} + dx^{349}\right) \tag{30}$$

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\mu^2}{9}\delta_{ij}, & i,j = 1,\dots 4\\ -\frac{\mu^2}{36}\delta_{ij}, & i,j = 5\dots 8\\ -\frac{4\mu^2}{9}, & i = j = 9\ . \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

The solution is obtained by taking a solution preserving 24 supersymmetries given by taking $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, $\alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = 0$ in the four-parameter case and permuting the values of the k_i: equation (13) is no longer satisfied, and thus this solution only admits 16 supersymmetries.

Let us analyse the centraliser of the isometry group. Now $k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = k_4 = \frac{\mu}{3}$, $k_5 = \dots = k_8 = \frac{\mu}{6}$ and $k_9 = \frac{2\mu}{3}$. Equation (21) then implies that $m_1 = \dots = m_4$ and $m_5 = \dots = m_8 \equiv m$. Moreover, $m_1 = 2m_5$ and

$m_9 = 4m_5$: in other words, $m_1, \dots m_4$ and m_9 will always be even, and since they correspond to the transverse directions that appear in the form of Θ, all elements of Z will preserve F as well. Thus, Z is of the form

$$Z = \{\gamma_{\alpha,k} \in Z \mid \gamma_{\alpha,k}(x^+, x^-, x^i) = \left(x^+ + \alpha, x^- + \beta, x^{1,2,3,4}, (-1)^k x^{5,\dots,8}, x^9\right)\}\ , \tag{32}$$

Again, Z is generated by $\gamma_{\alpha,0}$ and $\gamma_{0,1}$. These elements lift to the spinor bundle as $\Gamma_{\alpha,0} = \pm\mathbb{1}$ and $\Gamma_{0,1} = \pm\Gamma_{5678}$. The Killing spinors are of the form given in equation (11). We could, of course, use the method described in the previous section and decompose the spinorial parameter ψ_+ into eigenspinors of Θ and work out precisely how $\Gamma_{0,1}$ acts on them, but it is sufficient to observe that (3) becomes

$$\varepsilon_{\psi_+}(\gamma_{0,1}(x)) = \varepsilon_{\Gamma_{1234}\psi_+}(x)\ .$$

For this equation to be satisfied we must have $\Gamma_{5678}\psi_+ = \pm\Gamma_{1234}\psi_+$. In other words, ψ_+ must lie in the $\pm$-eigenspaces of $\Gamma_{12\dots8}$, depending on which lift of $\gamma_{0,1}$ we choose. Half of the ψ_+ satisfy this additional condition; $\Gamma_{12\dots8}$ commutes with X_i^2, so demanding that its eigenspinors belong to the $\pm$-eigenspace of $\Gamma_{12\dots8}$ is an independent constraint.

We conclude that out of the four possible spin structures on the quotient, two admit no Killing spinors and two preserve 8 of the original sixteen supersymmetries, thus showing that the inequality in our conjecture must be sharp.

6. Conclusions

In this paper we have examined the symmetric discrete quotients of all the known symmetric M-theory backgrounds with more than 16 Killing spinors. In all cases, we found that there is a unique spin structure that preserves all of the original supersymmetry. It would be interesting to study the interplay between spin structure, symmetry and supersymmetry and find a formal proof of the conjecture presented in section 5. Failing that, as we mentioned in section 3, the known Hpp-wave solutions with supernumerary supersymmetries are very special and a more careful study of the moduli space of these solutions might reveal loci for which the matrix A is not diagonal but which still admit more than 16 Killing spinors. It would be interesting to see if these solutions could provide counterexamples to our conjecture.

References

[1] J. Figueroa-O'Farrill and S. Gadhia, "Supersymmetry and spin structures," `hep-th/0506229`.

[2] H. Baum, "Twistor spinors on lorentzian symmetric spaces," *Journal of Geometry and Physics* (2000), no. 34, 270–286.

[3] J. Michelson, "A pp-wave with 26 supercharges," *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** (2002) 5935–5949.

[4] J. Figueroa-O'Farrill and G. Papadopoulos, "Homogeneous fluxes, branes and a maximally supersymmetric solution of M-theory," *J. High Energy Phys.* **06** (2001), no. 036, `hep-th/0105308`.

[5] S. Philip, *Supersymmetry of homogeneous M-theory backrounds and plane wave limits.* PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2005.

[6] J. P. Gauntlett and C. M. Hull, "pp-waves in 11-dimensions with extra supersymmetry," *JHEP* **06** (2002) 013, `hep-th/0203255`.

[7] N. Ohta and M. Sakaguchi, "Uniqueness of M-theory pp-wave background with extra supersymmetries," *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004).

[8] M. Cvetic, H. Lü, and C. N. Pope, "M-theory PP-waves, Penrose limits and supernumerary supersymmetries," *Nucl. Phys* **B644** (2002) 65–84, `hep-th/0203229`.

[9] T. Neukirchner, "Solvable pseudo-riemannian symmetric spaces," `math/0301326`.

[10] M. Cahen and Y. Kerbrat, "Champs de vecteurs conformes et transformations conformes des spaces lorentzian symetriques," *J. Math. pures et appl.* **IX** (1978) 99–132.

[11] J. A. Wolf, *Spaces of constant curvature.* McGraw Hill, 1977.

Appendix A. Metrics of pp-waves with supernumerary supersymmetries

μ_9	$\mu_i, i = 1 \ldots 8$
$-\frac{1}{9}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2-\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-2\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2-2\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3-2\alpha_4)^2$
$-\frac{1}{9}(-\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(2\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-2\alpha_2-\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+2\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2-\alpha_3-2\alpha_4)^2$
$-\frac{1}{9}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2-\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(2\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-2\alpha_2-\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+2\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2-\alpha_3+2\alpha_4)^2$
$-\frac{1}{9}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(2\alpha_1-\alpha_2-\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-2\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2-2\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+2\alpha_4)^2$
$-\frac{1}{9}(-\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+2\alpha_2-\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+2\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2-\alpha_3+2\alpha_4)^2$
$-\frac{1}{9}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2-\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(2\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+2\alpha_2-\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+2\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2-\alpha_3-2\alpha_4)^2$
$-\frac{1}{9}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(2\alpha_1+\alpha_2-\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(-\alpha_1-2\alpha_2-\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(-\alpha_1+\alpha_2+2\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(-\alpha_1+\alpha_2-\alpha_3+2\alpha_4)^2$
$-\frac{1}{9}(-\alpha_1+\alpha_2-\alpha_3+\alpha_4)^2$	$\mu_1=\mu_2=-\frac{1}{36}(-2\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_3=\mu_4=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1+2\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_5=\mu_6=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2-2\alpha_3-\alpha_4)^2$ $\mu_7=\mu_8=-\frac{1}{36}(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\alpha_3+2\alpha_4)^2$

TABLE 1. Metrics associated to different eigenvalues of Θ for the 4-parameter ansatz

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND, UK
E-mail address: `H.J.Rajaniemi@sms.ed.ac.uk`

$\mu_8 = \mu_9$	$\mu_i,\ i = 1 \dots 7$
$-\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 - 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - 2\beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$
$-\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + 2\beta_3 - \beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 + 2\beta_4 - 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 + \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 + 2\beta_4 + \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 - 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + 2\beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 - \beta_4 - 2\beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$
$-\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - 2\beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 - 2\beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 + \beta_5 - 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 - 2\beta_5 + \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - \beta_2 - 2\beta_3 - 2\beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - \beta_2 - 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 - 2\beta_5 - 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$
$-\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 + 2\beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 + 2\beta_4 + 2\beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 - 2\beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 + 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 - 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 + \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 - \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$
$-\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 + \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 - 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 - 2\beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 - 2\beta_5 + 2\beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$
$-\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - 2\beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 + 2\beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 + 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - \beta_2 - 2\beta_3 + 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - \beta_2 - 2\beta_3 - \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 + 2\beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$
$-\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 + \beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 + 2\beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(-2\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 - 2\beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 - 2\beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 + \beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 + \beta_6 - 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - 2\beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$
$-\frac{1}{36}(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \beta_7)^2$	$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_2 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{36}(2\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_4 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$ $\mu_5 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 - \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_6 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 - 2\beta_4 - \beta_5 - \beta_6 + 2\beta_7)^2$ $\mu_7 = -\frac{1}{36}(-\beta_1 - \beta_2 + 2\beta_3 + \beta_4 + 2\beta_5 + 2\beta_6 - \beta_7)^2$

TABLE 2. Metrics associated to different eigenvalues of Θ for the 7-parameter ansatz